

REMARKS

The Abstract has been objected to for exceeding 150 words. The Applicants have revised to Abstract to have less than 150 words, thereby overcoming this objection.

Claim 1 has been objected to because the limitation "defining for each byte of packet have an EDC code portion and a data portion" is not clearly written. The Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite "defining each byte of the packet to have an EDC code portion and a data portion", thereby overcoming this objection.

Claims 1-4 have also been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph in view of the limitation of Claim 1, which recites "defining for each byte of packet have an EDC code portion and a data portion". The Applicants have amended Claim 1 to recite "defining each byte of the packet to have an EDC code portion and a data portion", thereby overcoming this rejection of Claims 1-4.

Claims 1 and 4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ragle (U.S. Patent 4,052,698).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "defining each byte of the packet to have an EDC code portion and a data portion, wherein each EDC code portion is a distributed portion of a complete EDC code", "storing said data portion and said EDC code portion of each byte of the packet in the memory module" and "reading out said data portion and said EDC code portion of each byte of the packet from said memory module".

Support for this amendment appears in the specification as originally filed in paragraph [0080]. No new matter is added. Note that paragraph [0080] specifies an advantage of these steps as follows, "The destined memory module stores both the EDC code and data indiscriminately, in other words

it simply stores the whole packet in the cache or in the memory core without further data processing." (Emphasis added.)

Ragle teaches that a parity bit P is computed for each of seven 8-bit characters (i.e., bytes) D1-D7, and that an error check character E is computed for the seven character word, wherein the error check character forms an eighth character of the word. (Ragle, Col. 3, lines 59-68.) However, Ragle teaches that the resulting 8-bit by 9-bit matrix must be converted to a 10-bit by 9-bit matrix before recording onto tape 102. (Ragle, Col. 4, lines 1-4.) The conversion required by Ragle undesirably requires a separate encoder 110. (Ragle, Col. 4, lines 5-23; Figs. 1-3.) The conversion required by Ragle also undesirably requires a larger memory, because the conversion increases the number of required storage bits. The conversion required by Ragle also undesirably increases the memory access time.

However, Ragle teaches that this conversion is required to provide "no more than two adjacent zeros", and to "never [have] more than one zero leading or ending a code". (Ragle, Col. 4, lines 15-23.) Fig. 2 of Ragle illustrates the conversion of an 8-bit by 9-bit matrix (which includes parity bits P and error check character E) to a 10-bit by 9-bit matrix (which includes generic bits X).

By teaching that this conversion is necessary, Ragle explicitly teaches away from storing the parity bits P and the error check character E on the tape 102. Ragle therefore fails to teach "storing said data portion and said EDC code portion of each byte of the packet in the memory module" as recited by amended Claim 1. Because Ragle fails to teach "storing said data portion and said EDC code portion of each byte of the packet in the memory module" as recited by amended Claim 1, Ragle also necessarily fails to

teach "reading out said data portion and said EDC code portion of each byte of the packet from said memory module" as recited by amended Claim 1.

For these reasons, Claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Ragle. Claim 4, which depends from Claim 1, is not anticipated by Ragle for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ragle in view of Brune (U.S. Patent 3,665,393). Claim 2, which depends from Claim 1, is allowable over Ragle for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Because Brune does not seem to remedy the above-described deficiencies of Ragle, Claim 2 is allowable over the combination of Ragle and Brune for at least the same reasons that Claim 1 is allowable over Ragle.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ragle. Claim 3, which depends from Claim 1, is allowable over Ragle for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

The Applicant has added new Claims 5-11. Support for these claims exists in the specification as originally filed in paragraphs [0077]-[0083] and in Figs. 8, 9, 10a and 10b. No new matter is added.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-11 are pending in the present Application. Reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions or comments, he is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

**/E. Eric Hoffman/**

Customer No. 22888

E. Eric Hoffman  
Reg. No. 38,186  
Attorney for Applicants  
BEVER, HOFFMAN & HARMS, LLP

Tel. No.: (925) 895-3545

Fax No.: (408) 451-5908